

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-35 were previously pending in the application. Claim 3 is canceled, claims 1, 16-19, 22-24, and 35 are amended; and new claims 36-49 are added herein. Assuming the entry of this amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-49 are now pending in the application. The Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

On page 2 of the final office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi. On page 3, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 11-12, 16-17, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singer in view of Knappe. On page 5, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 18-19, 22-24, 30, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singer in view of Knappe, and further in view of Johnston. On page 6, the Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singer in view of Knappe, and further in view of Curry. On page 6, the Examiner also rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singer in view of Knappe, and further in view of Johnston, and further in view of Curry. On page 7, the Examiner objected to claims 3, 5-6, 8, 13-15, 20-21, 25-26, 28, 31, and 33-34 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. For the following reasons, the Applicant submits that all of the now-pending claims are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 1, 16-19, 22-24, and 35

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of previously pending claim 3. As such, currently amended claim 1 is equivalent to previously pending claim 3 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that currently amended claim 1 is allowable. Claims 16-19, 22-24, and 35 have been similarly amended. As such, the Applicant submits that those claims are also allowable. Since claims 2, 4-15, 20-21, and 25-34 depend variously from claims 1, 19, and 24, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

New Claims 36-49

Support for new claims 36-49 is found as follows:

<u>New Claim</u>	<u>Support</u>
36	Claims 1 and 5
37	Claims 1 and 6
38	Claims 1 and 8
39	Claim 13
40	Claim 14
41	Claim 15
42	Claims 1 and 28
43	Claims 19 and 20
44	Claims 19 and 21
45	Claims 19 and 31
46	Claims 19 and 33
47	Claims 19 and 34
48	Claims 24 and 25
49	Claims 24 and 26

New claim 36 is equivalent to previously pending claim 5 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 36 is allowable.

New claim 37 is equivalent to previously pending claim 6 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 37 is allowable.

New claim 38 is equivalent to previously pending claim 8 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 38 is allowable. Since claims 39-41 depend variously from claim 38, it is further submitted that those claims are also allowable.

New claim 42 is equivalent to previously pending claim 28 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 42 is allowable.

New claim 43 is equivalent to previously pending claim 20 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 43 is allowable.

New claim 44 is equivalent to previously pending claim 21 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 44 is allowable.

New claim 45 is equivalent to previously pending claim 31 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 45 is allowable.

New claim 46 is equivalent to previously pending claim 33 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 46 is allowable.

New claim 47 is equivalent to previously pending claim 34 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 34 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 47 is allowable.

New claim 48 is equivalent to previously pending claim 25 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 48 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 25 is allowable.

New claim 49 is equivalent to previously pending claim 26 rewritten in independent form. Since the Examiner stated that previously pending claim 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, the Applicant submits that new claim 49 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that the rejections of claims under Sections 102(e) and 103(a) have been overcome.


Although this amendment after final adds 13 claims to the total number of claims that were previously pending, this increase resulted from simply rewriting dependent claims that were directed to

allowable subject matter into independent form. As such, the Applicant requests that the Examiner enter this amendment notwithstanding the increase in the number of claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, and early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/5/05
Customer No. 46900
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1515 Market Street, Suite 715
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102


Steve Mendelsohn
Registration No. 35,951
Attorney for Applicant
(215) 557-6657 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)